

**From:** Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 3/22/2012 7:11:30 PM  
**To:** Gilberto Irizarry/DC/USEPA/US@EPA; Stanton.Larry@epamail.epa.gov  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Fw: Dimock meetings with residents (Propublic inquiry!!!)

I will check with Ron B, on what happened.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Shawn Garvin  
**Sent:** 03/22/2012 05:13 PM EDT  
**To:** Bob Sussman; Betsaida Alcantara; Brendan Gilfillan; Dana Tulis; Lisa Feldt; Mathy Stanislaus; Ramona Trovato; William Early; Ron Borsellino; Michael Kulik  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents (Propublic inquiry!!!)

Call-in Number: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**

**From:** Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US  
**To:** Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Cc:** Betsaida Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Brendan Gilfillan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Feldt/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mathy Stanislaus/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ramona Trovato" <Trovato.Ramona@epamail.epa.gov>, William Early/R3/USEPA/US, Borsellino.Ron@epamail.epa.gov, Michael Kulik/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 03/22/2012 05:03 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents (Propublic inquiry!!!)

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

**From:** Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US  
**To:** Betsaida Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Brendan Gilfillan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Shawn Garvin/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Feldt/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mathy Stanislaus/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dana Tulis/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ramona Trovato" <Trovato.Ramona@epamail.epa.gov>  
**Date:** 03/22/2012 04:58 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents (Propublic inquiry!!!)

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Betsaida Alcantara  
**Sent:** 03/22/2012 04:50 PM EDT  
**To:** Bob Sussman; Brendan Gilfillan; Shawn Garvin; Lisa Feldt; Mathy Stanislaus; Dana Tulis  
**Subject:** Fw: Dimock meetings with residents (Propublic inquiry!!!)

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

----- Forwarded by Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US on 03/22/2012 04:40 PM -----

**From:** Abrahm Lustgarten <Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org>  
**To:** Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 03/22/2012 04:26 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Dimock meetings with residents

Thanks Roy,

I'll look forward to the written response. There is a lot that I would like to better understand though. Would it be possible to have a background or off-record conversation with someone on the technical side, who can tell me candidly about the test methods, about the detection limits, and about what has happened in EPA decision making about how and how fast to make these tests public? Then we could decide where to go from there on the record, but maybe that would remove some of the stakes preventing a good flow of information.

At this point, I'm looking hard at the detection limits. I'm left to speculate here, but I'm now guessing perhaps your system snafus prevented the J's from showing up on minute detections. But that raises other questions: Why are you listing estimated detections several orders of magnitude away from your detection limits? If the detection limits are expressed accurately, how would that be possible? For instance, in one test benzo(a)pyrene is listed non-detect, with a "U" and a detection limit of 5ug/L. In another test it was listed as "detected" at .05 ug/L. (now in the new version it is estimated at .05ug/L "J"). And by the same token, why are all the detection limits more or less the same – and relatively high? Wouldn't they be different for different substances? And for Benzo(a)pyrene, which has an MCL of .20 ug/L max, why would a detection limit of 5.0 ug/L be acceptable? Finally... items exceeding the trigger level have been forwarded to a toxicologist, I understand, but why wouldn't the one 2.0 ug/L estimated detection of benzo(a)pyrene in HW04 have been sent to a toxicologist? Were these all done by the same lab? Were there different methods applied to different tests or for different substances? Is any of this background technical information releasable? (Surely it can't have privacy concerns attached to it)

Bigger picture: My impression here is that the EPA has not done a very careful job of quality testing this data, or explaining it to residents, or even going over it before releasing it, and I'm curious whether that is the case and why? You must have expected close scrutiny of the material. Was the first version just run out of your system and given to residents without being reviewed/confirmed? What was done after that that resulted in the second versions? Why was the material released before the other 50 homes were analyzed?

I suspect these are not all things you want to discuss on the record, but if you want accurate coverage of this I'll need to at least understand it better. If you can help me understand, then I'll probably have a very different approach to reporting the material. But so far, the way this has unfolded, just seems weird, to be honest.

Thanks, and I look forward to hearing back.

Abrahm  
917-589-1262

**From:** Roy Seneca [mailto:Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 12:01 PM  
**To:** Abrahm Lustgarten  
**Cc:** Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US; Betsaida Alcantara; Michael Kulik; Terri-A White  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents

Abrahm -- I got your voice message. I'm working on getting a response to your questions from last night. If you have other questions, please email us and we will try to get back to you as soon as possible.

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer

Office of Public Affairs  
[seneca.roy@epa.gov](mailto:seneca.roy@epa.gov)  
(215) 814-5567

From: Abrahm Lustgarten <[Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org](mailto:Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org)>  
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Michael Kulik/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, "[Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)" <[Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)>, Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US <[Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)>, Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Betsaida Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/22/2012 12:12 PM  
Subject: Re: Dimock meetings with residents

Hi Roy, i look forward to hearing from you today, by email if you like, or if you want to call, ill be at my desk in about 45 minutes, 1 pm eastern.

Thank you  
Abrahm

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 21, 2012, at 6:49 PM, "Roy Seneca" <[Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov)> wrote:

We will have to get back to you tomorrow...

**From:** Abrahm Lustgarten [[Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org](mailto:Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org)]  
**Sent:** 03/21/2012 09:37 PM AST  
**To:** Roy Seneca  
**Cc:** Michael Kulik; "[Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)" <[Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)>; Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US <[Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov](mailto:Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov)>; Terri-A White  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents

Thank you Roy,

But can you tell me anything more in detail? Could we talk by phone? 917-589-1262 I'm hearing at first residents were told that the delay was due to a printer error. I'm also hearing that some of the test values have changed between the first copies delivered and a new round delivered. Why would that be and what would it mean?

And I think its still very important at this point to address some of the unresolved questions from yesterday before my last story: what is the methane situation, why was it portrayed the way it was on March 15? What about the Benzo(a)pyrene and other Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons? Terri wrote me this morning that the highest reading was 1.6 ug/L — not past the MCL of 2.0. But that's not what my test pages say — they have a reading of 2.0 in a clean lab detection. (And even besides, I would be surprised to hear no concern about a detection of a carcinogen close to the MCL, and especially when there are minute detections of multiple carcinogens.)

So lots to talk about — I think its important to be able to answer some of these questions in order to stop what obviously is a seriously deepening level of concern among Dimock residents, and among

those following this story elsewhere.

**From:** Roy Seneca <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov>  
**Date:** Wed, 21 Mar 2012 21:29:00 -0400  
**To:** Abraham Lustgarten <Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org>  
**Cc:** Michael Kulik <Kulik.Michael@epamail.epa.gov>, Roy Seneca <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov>, "Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov" <Betsaida@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov>, "Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov" <Alcantara/DC/USEPA/US@mintra03.pyd.epa.gov>, Terri-A White <White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Dimock meetings with residents

Abraham -- Sorry for not getting something to you sooner...have a good evening...

Meetings previously scheduled for Thursday and Friday with seven Dimock residents have had to be delayed due to a backlog of work. EPA will be working with residents to reschedule new times for early next week.

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer  
Office of Public Affairs  
[seneca.roy@epa.gov](mailto:seneca.roy@epa.gov)  
(215) 814-5567

**Re: Dimock meetings with residents** Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

03/21/2012 08:15 PM

**Betsaida Alcantara** to: Abraham Lustgarten, Michael Kulik, Roy Seneca

+ Roy and Mick in the region

**From:** Abraham Lustgarten [[Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org](mailto:Abrahm.Lustgarten@propublica.org)]  
**Sent:** 03/21/2012 08:14 PM AST  
**To:** Betsaida Alcantara  
**Subject:** Dimock meetings with residents

Betsaida,

Hi, I'm hearing that resident's meetings with the EPA to explain and go over their water test results are being cancelled? Is there anything more you can tell me about what's happening, and why?

Thank you,  
Abrahm